

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed February 18, 2010, considered and rejected claims 1, 3-6, 8, 9, 11-15, 17, 20, 21 and 28-37. Claims 1, 3-6, 8, 9, 11-15, 17, 20, 21 and 28-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Lin et al.* (U.S. Publ. No. 2005/0091226).

Summary of the In Person Interview

The following remarks were presented for discussion during the in person interview on March 10. During the interview, the examiner agreed with Applicant's position that Lin does not teach each limitation of the independent claims as addressed below, and that as a 102(e) reference that was commonly owned, Lin cannot be used in an obvious rejection.

Traversal of the Anticipation Rejections

The present invention is directed to a source code control ("SCC") application that provides enhanced functionality while working in the offline state. For example, the present invention, as addressed in the previous response, facilitates undo and difference operations by caching a pristine copy of a source code file when it is checked out for modification. The modifications are not made to this pristine copy, but to the actual checked out source code file. It is noted that there are two different files involved in this process: (1) the source code file itself that was downloaded to the client-side client workspace, and (2) the pristine copy of the source code file that is created when the source code file is checked out from the client-side client workspace for modification. Both of these files are on the client and are different from the actual source code file on the server-side source control repository.

The examiner has again maintained his 102(e) rejections in the current action. Applicant submits, however, that in order for a reference to anticipate a claim, each limitation must be taught by the reference. This is not the case with Lin. Lin is not directed to a SCC system. Source code is not even mentioned in Lin. To the contrary, Lin is directed to SMB and DFS. Even if the aspects of how Lin and the present invention function were similar, Lin could only anticipate the present claims if it teaches every claimed aspect. The claims contain specific limitations that clearly indicate that they are directed to a source code control system. The examiner is reading these limitations out of the claims in order to retain the 102(e) rejection.

In the Response to Arguments section of the Office Action, the examiner argues that the caching of the files to the local data store in Lin is the same as the present invention. This cannot be so. In Lin, there is a single cached copy of the file. This cached copy is modified directly. In

contrast, the present invention downloads (or caches) the source code file first in the client-side client workspace. Then, when it is checked out, a separate pristine copy of the source code file is created and stored in the file cache of the client-side client source code control component. At this point, there are two copies of the source code file on the client. Lin discloses nothing similar to this, and therefore cannot teach these limitations. Again, it is emphasized that for a reference to anticipate, it must teach every limitation. Because Lin does not teach these limitations, it cannot anticipate the independent claims. Applicant therefore requests that the current rejections be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the other rejections to the claims are now moot and do not, therefore, need to be addressed individually at this time. In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at (801) 322-8427.

Dated this 11th day of March, 2010.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian Tucker/

RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
BRIAN D. TUCKER
Registration No. 61,550
Attorneys for Applicant
Customer No. 47973